

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2006.

No amendments, cancellations, or additions are made to the claims. As a result, claims 1-23 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as Anticipated by Raghavan

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raghavan et al. (U.S. 2003/0134607). Applicant does not admit that Raghavan is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind Raghavan as provided for under 37 C.F.R. §1.131.

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Raghavan does not appear to disclose all of the structural elements recited in independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20. For example, regarding claims 1 and 8, Raghavan does not appear to disclose selectively coupling one of the plurality of receivers to a second frequency reference to communicate with a second station over a signal path not included in the plurality of signal paths. Raghavan, as best understood, discloses only a single reference.

Applicant has reviewed paragraphs 0026 and 0122 cited by the Examiner and has not been able to find the disclosure of a second frequency reference to communicate with a second station over a signal path not included in the plurality of signal paths. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out the specific paragraph and line numbers that support the Examiner's assertion.

Similarly, with regard to claims 13 and 20, Raghavan does not appear to disclose, for example, that at least one of the plurality of receivers can be selectively coupled to the first frequency reference or to a second frequency reference to communicate with a second station

using a signal path not included in the plurality of signal paths. Raghavan does not appear to disclose first and second references. Moreover, Raghavan does not appear to describe communicating with a second station using a signal path not included in the plurality of signal paths.

For the above reasons, independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 should be found to be allowable over Raghavan, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Raghavan be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of the claims to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Ann M. McCrackin (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) at (612) 349-9592 or Applicant's below-signed attorney (located in Phoenix, Arizona) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID JOHNSTON

By his Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(602) 298-8920

By /  /

Walter W. Nielsen
Reg. No. 25,539